

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

OCTOBER 10, 2018

Present: Chairman Stephen Garvin, Charles Karustis, John Hincks, Nancy Kilcoyne, Meagen Donoghue (Director of Planning and Community Development), and Beth Suedmeyer (Environmental Planner).

Absent: Vice-Chairman Peter Abair, Justin Finnicum.

The statutory requirements as to notice having been complied with, the meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m., in the Flynn Building, Silva Room.

Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management – Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board – 8 Stone Road, (Assessor’s Map K06-0303)

At 7:30 p.m., Chairman Garvin opened the public hearing.

Present: Applicant Aruna Pundit, Owner of Aruna’s Place; Contractor Jack Kelleher; and the Design Review Board.

Mr. Kelleher stated that Aruna’s Place needs more space and the proposed addition includes 672 square feet. He added that the project engineer was not present this evening, but would be present at the next Board meeting.

Chairman Garvin explained the Peer Review Response aspect to the applicant and the required deadline for submission.

Mr. Kelleher maintained that the school staff, students, and related traffic would not be increased with the proposed addition. He said that Ms. Pundit just wants to meet the needs of the community.

Ms. Pundit commented on the success of her school.

Chairman Garvin stated that the Board appreciated the work done at the school, and added that the proposed project must meet some requirements, which would be discussed at the next meeting; perhaps on October 24. He recommended that the Stormwater Management checklist be given to the applicant, to ensure consistency.

Mr. Karustis asked if there was a deck in place, currently. Mr. Kelleher responded that there was, and stated that the deck would be removed. Mr. Kelleher stated that currently the school has no administrative space for the staff and the second floor of the proposed addition would be dedicated as administrative space only.

Chairman Garvin inquired about lighting. Mr. Kelleher replied that lighting was not included in the plan yet, and then asked for a listing of required items.

Ms. Kilcoyne inquired about the height of the building and how it compared to the next-door neighbor’s roof. Mr. Kelleher responded that it was 17’ 2” high and added that the abutter’s roof might be higher.

Susan Vollaro, Design Review Board Member, asked about the existing and proposed egress doors and said that there was some discrepancy with the elevation renderings. Mr. Kelleher detailed that a stairway

was removed, which was why the detail for two exterior doors was not included. Ms. Vollaro mentioned that it would be helpful to see all doors, as well as being able to see how the existing plans relate.

Daniel Martin, Chairman of the Design Review Board mentioned the importance of illustrating how the proposed addition relates to the existing building.

Mr. Kelleher responded that at the next meeting, the existing building would be clearly depicted with its footprint, as well.

Chairman Garvin stated that the Design Review Board is looking at aesthetics and the exterior, primarily, but elevations, stormwater, and site plan detail is important. He further stressed that the existing building detail, and the scope of the neighborhood, as to how it sits on the site; is also important.

Ms. Vollaro mentioned that existing windows, doors and other elements; should match those of the proposed addition. Ms. Pundit replied that everything will match.

Chairman Garvin suggested that the Design Review Board provide a list for the applicant.

Design Review Chairman Martin stated that it was very important to see elevations, and the connection detail to the existing building.

Jennifer Koffel, Design Review Board Member added that landscape detail is also needed.

A discussion pertaining to the site's land contours took place.

Chairman Garvin agreed and suggested that Planning Board staff provide the applicant with a needed outline.

Ms. Donoghue stressed the importance of the elevation plans, lighting, and landscaping plan, as well as responses to the peer reviewer. She detailed that Sudbury Building Inspector, Mark Herweck, said that the plans must follow the current building code. Ms. Donoghue added that neither the Board of Health, nor the Fire Department provided any specific comments at this time. She said that changes to an existing institutional building trigger site plan specifications and detail.

Mr. Hincks stated that the project is a good one, but the plan must include additional information.

Chairman Garvin suggested that the hearing could be continued on October 24, if peer review responses were provided to the Board by October 17th. He added that if the applicant needed more time, the hearing could be continued and presented at the November 14th meeting.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management Permit – 8 Stone Road, (Assessor's Map K06-0303) to October 24, 2018.

Chairman Garvin stated that it would be preferred to have a joint meeting with the Design Review Board, at the next hearing.

Design Review Board Chairman Martin said he would try to coordinate the time, and have the Design Review Board, be at the next meeting.

Immediately Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management – 554 Boston Post Road, (Assessor’s Map K06-0602)

Chairman Garvin stated that this hearing would be presented on October 24.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management Permit – 554 Boston Post Road, (Assessor’s Map K06-0602) to the October 24, 2018 meeting.

Immediately Continued Public Hearing – Definitive Subdivision, Stormwater Management, & Scenic Road – Powers Road, (Assessor’s Map B09-0001).

Chairman Garvin stated that this hearing would be continued at the October 24th meeting.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing – Definitive Subdivision, Stormwater Management, & Scenic Road Application – Powers Road, (Assessor’s Map B09-0001) to October 24, 2018..

Discussion – Quarry North Zoning

Present: Attorney Jonathon Silverstein, Town Counsel; Attorney William Henchy, Quarry North Counsel; Chris Claussen, Quarry North Developer.

At 8:00 p.m. Chairman Garvin opened the discussion regarding Quarry North zoning and stated that a Special Town Meeting is scheduled for December 14th, to vote on related zoning changes applicable to Quarry North, which could encompass other zoning options; such as mixed-use overlay districting, as was done at Meadow Walk.

Attorney Silverstein stated that there have been fruitful negotiations with the developer, and now there is more associated detail to be worked out. He said that the Town wants to address some questions and get a better idea about timeframe. He added that this is a somewhat unusual process, given the Sudbury Station development aspect, which had more income-restricted units proposed, than does the Quarry North proposal. Attorney Silverstein stressed that the Town has a good working relationship with the developer, and the necessary zoning factors may be presented at December Town Meeting in two ways: 1) to recommend a special zoning permit or overlay permit for the 100 unit 40B aspect and 2) setting the density of the 174 market-rate units.

Attorney Silverstein mentioned that a preliminary draft will be prepared by the end of the month, as an outline is to be included at the Board’s November 14th meeting for review in advance of the Quarry North Public Zoning Forum on November 28 or December 5th. He added that Planning Board contribution would be most beneficial in this process.

Attorney Silverstein restated and clarified that two article components would likely be included at Town Meeting. One article would address affordable housing units to be classified as either 40B or 40R units for high-density housing with certain advantages to the Town; and secondly, that another article for the 174 market-rate development units would require special permitting as well.

Mr. Hincks asked if the end result at Town Meeting in December would be to have both disposition of the Melone property voted on, as well as the proposed zoning plan/s that would also be voted on.

Ms. Donoghue stated that the Board meets the second and fourth weeks of the month, but the Board could schedule a special meeting during this time. Chairman Garvin and Board members agreed with this suggestion.

Attorney Henchy commented that he and Mr. Claussen came to the meeting this evening in order to keep the Board informed and actively involved and stated that the developers understand the concern regarding Rt. 117 traffic. Quarry North is paying for the Traffic Impact Study done by the Town's consultant, as well as assuming the cost of the Capacity Study and School Impact Study. He added that Quarry North would also be paying for the cost of the Special Town Meeting in December. He informed the Board that there would be a meeting on Monday, with Liz Rust of HOME, Attorney Silverstein, Mr. Claussen, and himself to further examine the details of a potential 40R development.

A Board discussion took place regarding the elements associated with a 40R development.

Mr. Karustis reiterated that the developer would review all options for the affordable housing aspect.

Chairman Garvin commented that the Board would be reviewing and providing any further edits/recommendations to the draft related to the Public Zoning Forum. Mr. Hincks added that this type of process worked well, with the Meadow Walk project; and thanked the developers for their cooperation.

Mr. Claussen summarized that he wanted to build a continued and trusting relationship with the Town.

Broadacres Farm Acquisition Update and Discussion

Present: Attorney Jonathan Silverstein

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that the Town came to an agreement with the owner of Broadacres Farm and that Broadacres would be an include article at Town Meeting on October 15. Ms. Suedmeyer provided a narrative presentation about Broadacres Farm, and said that the Farm is an active 61A property, housing an active horse farm with stables and pastures, on a scenic road, that abuts much conservation land.

Ms. Suedmeyer stressed that the Farm is listed as a Critical Concern in the Heritage Landscape Inventory and represents the cultural and agricultural history of the Town. This is a great opportunity for the Town to maintain a contiguous spread of Town-owned land.

Chairman Garvin suggested that Ms. Suedmeyer's presentation would be great to share with residents at Town Meeting next week. Attorney Silverstein recommended that the presentation would be great to show at several meetings in Town.

Selectman Dretler asked if acreage could be added to the labeling of the overhead graphs. The Board agreed. It was indicated that it would reflect a total of some 300 acres with the potential Sudbury Station area included.

Ms. Suedmeyer mentioned that the Rail Trail would be connected to all the displayed open space parcels and referred to the map of contiguous town-owned land, including: Featherland Park and everything west of the Rail Trail, totaling 165 acres; Nixon and SVT land, totaling 220 acres; and the addition of two potential projects to be considered at Town Meeting – Broadacres Farm and the Quarry North land swap (Sudbury Station), totaling approximately 300 acres.

Ms. Suedmeyer pointed out that of that acreage; 110 acres would be destined for conservation land, 90 acres for recreation, 18 acres for historic and cemetery purposes, 50 acres for municipal and school use, and the Rail Trail as an anticipated lease.

Mr. Hincks stated that home sites could be put on some part of the property. Ms. Suedmeyer stated that the Broadacres appraisal indicated that thirteen to fourteen homes could be put on the property from an appraisal prospective. The appraisal was performed by LandVest.

Ms. Suedmeyer detailed that Broadacres Farm comprises three parcels, and the first parcel would be conveyed sometime after a favorable Town Meeting vote and that Parcels 2 and 3 would be conveyed within a ten-year period. The full appropriation would be voted upon at Town Meeting, but would not be enacted until the actual closing, sometime in the future (for Phase 2 and 3). She also mentioned that the purchase price would be locked in now, at today's price rather than appreciating in a possible period up to ten years.

Chairman Garvin mentioned that there was a similar project in Wayland and much of the estimated appraisal value was reflected in Parcel 1.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that \$1,958,000 of CPA funds would be used for the initial Broadacres purchase of Parcel 1 and added that a detailed update would be presented at Monday's Town Meeting. She reiterated that the total purchase price of the Broadacres Farm was \$5.5 million, with all funding requested at Fall Town Meeting and as a ballot question appearing at the state election in November.

Mr. Hincks mentioned that the future financial commitment would be \$3.5 million. Ms. Suedmeyer thought that a 20-year bond was being discussed to fund parcels 2 and 3 at a later time.

Mr. Karustis asked about a notice period for the sale of Parcels 2 and 3. Ms. Suedmeyer thought that the notice would be a 30-day notice at minimum.

Attorney Silverstein mentioned that there was no accelerator clause in the Purchase and Sale Agreement.

Ms. Suedmeyer asked if the Board would vote to support this purchase. Chairman Garvin affirmed that the Board was in favor of this purchase.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To endorse the Broadacres Farm acquisition as it meets Town objectives stated in the current Master Plan for Sudbury.

Master Plan Update

At 8:38 p.m., Mr. Hincks informed the Board that the application for at-large candidates for the Master Plan Subcommittee was on-line, and that resident applications had to be submitted to the Board by October 29th. Mr. Hincks suggested that the Moderator make an announcement for the at-large membership, at Town Meeting on Monday night.

Ms. Donoghue suggested the additional e-mail approach, as was done at the Melone Charrette.

Administrative Report

Ms. Donoghue reminded the Board that the Avalon Celebration would be held tomorrow evening.

Minutes for Approval

No minutes were presented for approval.

Meeting Schedule

The Board agreed that the next meetings would be held on October 24th and November 14th.

Ms. Donoghue suggested November 8th as the additional meeting date.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To enter into Executive Session to discuss strategy with respect to potential litigation where an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the litigating position of the public body and the Chairman so declares regarding 648 Boston Post Road and not to return to open meeting.

Chairman Garvin ended the open meeting at 8:45 p.m.